



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/932,103	08/17/2001	Kavitha Vallari Devara	CA0591	5487		
3624	7590	05/11/2009	EXAMINER			
VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C. UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600 30 SOUTH 17TH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103				HOSSAIN, FARZANA E		
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER				
2424						
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE				
05/11/2009		PAPER				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/932,103	DEVARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	FARZANA HOSSAIN	2424	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10-14 and 20-24 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10-14 and 20-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 October 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to claims filed 02/10/2009. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14 and 20-23 are amended. Claims 3, 9 and 15-19 are cancelled. Claim 24 has been previously presented.
2. Claim 24 has a currently amended header. There has been no amendment. Therefore, it should be previously presented.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding Claims 1, 8 and 20, the applicant argues that Zigmond does not teach detecting incoming television signals from a plurality of sources for tag information identifying the source of the synchronized web simulcasts for a plurality of television programs (Pages 9-10). The applicant further argued that Ullman's invention is not related to simulcasts.

In response to the applicant's argument, Zigmond discloses detecting incoming television signals from different systems and from at least one source (Column 12, lines

66-67, Column 13, lines 1-3, Figure 2, Figure 3, 206) for tag information identifying the source of synchronized web simulcast for a program and being able to change channels and synchronizing content based on what is on the screen which is interpreted to be a plurality of programs. Shoff discloses a plurality of programs and synchronized content for each of the programs (Figure 3, Figures 8a-c).

Zigmond discloses retrieving at least one enhanced features and also discloses retrieving a number of enhanced features (Column 7, lines 55-67). Shoff also discloses a number of enhanced features (Figure 3). Zigmond discloses a simulcast which includes a synchronized web page displayed to a related TV program (Figure 2). Ullman discloses synchronized web pages with a TV program (Column 5, lines 7-11). See new rejection for content list showing for all programs, the feature descriptors indicating the enhanced features. The new combination discloses all the elements of the claims.

4. Applicant's arguments filed 02/10/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Claim 23, see arguments above to claims 1, 8 and 20.

In response to the argument, see response above for the arguments discussed above. The new limitations of claim 23 are not directed towards a content list showing for all programs, rather it is a content list associated with the audio visual information to a user in relation to each of the plurality of television programs. Shoff discloses a plurality of programs (Figure 3) and displaying the content list associated with the audio

visual information (Figure 8b, Figure 8c) to a user in relation to each of the plurality of television programs to enable a user to provide a choice indication (Figure 8b, Figure 8c); receiving a choice indication responsive to the content list (Figure 8b, Figure 8c) and simultaneously presenting the audio visual information synchronized together with at least part of the supplemental information, response to the choice (Figure 6, Figure 7, Figures 8b, 8c, Page 7, paragraphs 0081-0082, Page 8, Table 2, Trigger). See response above.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 21 recites "the content listing information." There is no antecedent basis and therefore the examiner assumes "the content listing information" to be --content listing information--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-13, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zigmond et al (US 6,571,392 and hereafter referred to as

“Zigmond”) in view of Shoff et al (US 2005/0015815 and hereafter referred to as “Shoff”) and Stautner et al (US 2009/0025033 and hereafter referred to as “Stautner”).

Regarding Claim 1, Zigmond discloses a method for managing television programs and their synchronized web simulcasts (Figure 2, Figure 3, Figure 4), the method comprising:

(a) detecting incoming television signals which can be from different systems or from at least one particular source (Column 12, lines 67, Column 13, lines 1-3) for tag information identifying the source of the synchronized web simulcasts for each of a plurality of television programs (Column 7, lines 49-51 - the viewer can change channels) or for each video program received on a broadcast channel with uniform resource locators (URLs) which identify Web pages which correspond to the program as receiver unit detects the resource identifiers as it receives the program via the interface unit and the decoding software of the digital processor (Column 12, lines 67, Column 13, lines 1-3, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67, Figure 3, Figure 4, 303)

(b) establishing a web connection to provide a communications channel to the source of the synchronized web simulcasts for each television program (Figure 2, 211);

(c) retrieving a number of enhanced features from the source of the synchronized web simulcasts (Figure 3, Figure 4, 303, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67);

(d) storing the retrieved enhanced features in a storage medium for subsequent retrieval (Figure 3, Figure 4, 304, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67),

(e) identifying the retrieved enhanced features based on URLs or URIs (Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67), processing retrieved enhanced features (Column 10, lines 33-57).

Zigmond is silent on a plurality of television programs from a plurality of sources; processing the retrieved enhanced features to generate feature descriptors; formatting the processed, retrieved enhanced features to predetermined criteria to generate a content list; presenting a display to a user showing, for all of the television programs, the content list indicating the feature descriptors of the enhanced features associated with that program.

Shoff discloses a plurality of programs and synchronized web simulcasts for each of the programs (Figure 3, Page 7, paragraphs 0081-0082); retrieving a number of enhanced features from the sources of synchronized web simulcasts (Page 2, paragraph 0019),

processing retrieved enhanced features to generate feature descriptors or the viewing computing unit uses the EPG application and the browser application to processes the target resource and target specification to generate feature descriptors for the supplemental content (Pages 5-6, paragraph 0066-0067, Page 3, paragraphs 0036-0039, Figure 3),

formatting the feature descriptors according to predetermined criteria or display layout to generate a content list (Page 4, paragraphs 0042-0047).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Zigmond to include a plurality of programs and

synchronized web simulcasts for each of the programs (Figure 3, Page 7, paragraphs 0081-0082); to process retrieved enhanced features without user intervention to generate feature descriptors including names, symbols, icons, labels and timing information (Pages 5-6, paragraph 0066-0067, Page 3, paragraphs 0036-0039), formatting the feature descriptors according to predetermined criteria to generate a content list (Page 4, paragraphs 0042-0047) as taught by Shoff in order to allow the viewer the supplemental content with the program in a presentation format decided by content providers (Page 1, paragraph 0013) as disclosed by Shoff for an aesthetically pleasing viewing experience.

In analogous art, Stautner discloses receiving a plurality of television signals from a plurality of television broadcasters (Page 1, paragraph 0007) and enhanced features and processing enhanced features to generate feature descriptors or indicators including icons (Figure 2, 3, 4, 30, 31, 40, 50, 60, 70, 71 and 80) and generating a content list (Page 2, paragraph 0022, 0023, Figures 2-4), and presenting a display to a user showing, for all of the television programs, the content list indicating the feature descriptors or indicators of the enhanced features associated with that program (Figures 2, 3, 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination to include a plurality of television signals from a plurality of television broadcasters (Page 1, paragraph 0007) and presenting a display to a user showing, for all of the television programs, the content list indicating the feature descriptors or indicators of the enhanced features

associated with that program (Figures 2, 3, 4) as taught by Stautner in order to view all EPG information in convenient manner that is more efficient to the viewer.

Furthermore, in *KSR International Co. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct 1727, No. 04-1350, slip. op. at 12 (2007), the Court found that if all the claimed elements are known in the prior art then one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yield predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding Claim 2, Zigmond, Shoff and Stautner disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Zigmond discloses displaying is performed interactively in response to the viewer's input (Column 7, lines 47-54). Shoff discloses displaying is performed interactively in response to the viewer's input (Figures 8a-8c, Figure 3) and creating the enhanced features in advance (Page 7, paragraphs 0080-83).

Regarding Claim 4, Zigmond, Shoff and Stautner disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Zigmond discloses selecting enhanced features tied to a TV program by a viewer (Column 7, lines 47-54). Shoff discloses selecting one of the enhanced features via the feature descriptors tied to a TV program by a viewer (Figure 3, Figures 8a-8c, Page 7, paragraphs 0081-0082). Stautner discloses selecting one of the enhanced features via the feature descriptors tied to a TV program by a viewer (Page 3, paragraph 0036).

Regarding Claim 5, Zigmond, Shoff and Stautner disclose all the limitations of Claim 4. Zigmond discloses displaying one of the enhanced features selected by the user with the corresponding TV program that is synchronized to the selected enhanced feature (Column 7, lines 47-54). Shoff discloses displaying one of the enhanced features selected by the user with the corresponding TV program that is synchronized to the selected enhanced feature (Page 6, paragraph 0067, Figures 8a-8c).

Regarding Claim 7, Zigmond, Shoff and Stautner disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Zigmond discloses the source includes Internet and television network (Figure 2, Column 5, lines 10-22). Shoff discloses the sources include television network, Internet, wired network or wireless technologies (Page 3, paragraphs 0032, 0037).

Regarding Claim 8, Zigmond discloses a method for managing television programs and their synchronized web simulcasts (Figure 2, Figure 3, Figure 4) and a method for presenting simulcast information, the method comprising:

(a) receiving a plurality of television programs or audio-visual information from possible different systems or at least one particular source (Column 12, lines 67, Column 13, lines 1-3, Figure 2, 205, Figure 3, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 49-51, 55-67 – the user can change channels);

(b) detecting incoming television signals or plurality of television programs for tag information identifying the respective sources of the synchronized web simulcasts or one website simulcasting supplemental information relating to the audio-visual information or a video program with embedded uniform resource locators (URLs) with

associated time stamps which identify Web pages which correspond to the program (Figure 2, 205, Figure 3, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67);

(c) determining whether the detected tag information indicates that the synchronized web simulcasts are being broadcast currently (Figure 2, 205, Figure 3, Column 6, lines 25-36, 60-67, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67, Column 8, lines 1-15, 24-35) and

establishing a web connection to the source of the synchronized web simulcasts indicated by the tag information (Column 6, lines 25-36, 60-67, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67);

downloading a number of enhanced features from the source of the synchronized web simulcasts (Column 6, lines 25-36, 60-67, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67, Column 8, lines 1-15, 24-35).

Zigmond discloses identifying the retrieved enhanced features based on URLs or URIs (Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67) and processing retrieved enhanced features (Column 10, lines 33-57). Zigmond is silent on a plurality of broadcasters, formatting the processed, retrieved enhanced features to predetermined criteria to generate a content list; presenting a display to the user showing, for all of the television programs, the content list indicating the feature descriptors of the enhanced features associated with the program, from which a selection can be made.

Shoff discloses a plurality of programs and synchronized web simulcasts for each of the programs (Figure 3, Page 7, paragraphs 0081-0082); retrieving a number of enhanced features from the sources of synchronized web simulcasts (Page 2,

paragraph 0019), processing retrieved enhanced features without user intervention to generate feature descriptors or the viewing computing unit uses the EPG application and the browser application to processes the target resource and target specification without user intervention to generate feature descriptors for the supplemental content (Pages 5-6, paragraph 0066-0067, Page 3, paragraphs 0036-0039, Figure 3), formatting the feature descriptors according to predetermined criteria or display layout to generate a content list (Page 4, paragraphs 0042-0047). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Zigmond a plurality of programs and synchronized web simulcasts for each of the programs (Figure 3, Page 7, paragraphs 0081-0082), to process retrieved enhanced features without user intervention to generate feature descriptors (Pages 5-6, paragraph 0066-0067, Page 3, paragraphs 0036-0039, Figure 3), formatting the feature descriptors according to predetermined criteria to generate a content list (Page 4, paragraphs 0042-0047) as taught by Shoff in order to allow the viewer the supplemental content with the program in a presentation format decided by content providers (Page 1, paragraph 0013) as disclosed by Shoff for an aesthetically pleasing viewing experience.

In analogous art, Stautner discloses receiving a plurality of television signals from a plurality of television broadcasters (Page 1, paragraph 0007) and enhanced features and processing enhanced features to generate feature descriptors or indicators including icons (Figure 2, 3, 4, 30, 31, 40, 50, 60, 70, 71 and 80) and generating a content list (Page 2, paragraph 0022, 0023, Figures 2-4), and presenting a display to a user showing, for all of the television programs, the content list indicating the feature

descriptors or indicators of the enhanced features associated with that program (Figures 2, 3, 4) from which the user can make a selection (Figure 2, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, Figure 3, Figure 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination to include a plurality of television signals from a plurality of television broadcasters (Page 1, paragraph 0007) and presenting a display to a user showing, for all of the television programs, the content list indicating the feature descriptors or indicators of the enhanced features associated with that program (Figures 2, 3, 4) from which the user can make a selection (Figure 2, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, Figure 3, Figure 4) as taught by Stautner in order to view all EPG information in convenient manner that is more efficient to the viewer.

Furthermore, in *KSR International Co. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct 1727, No. 04-1350, slip. op. at 12 (2007), the Court found that if all the claimed elements are known in the prior art then one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yield predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding Claim 10, Zigmond, Shoff and Stautner disclose all the limitations of Claim 8. Zigmond discloses selecting enhanced features by a viewer (Column 7, lines 47-54). Shoff discloses selecting one of the enhanced features via the feature descriptors (Figure 3, Figures 8a-8c, Page 7, paragraphs 0081-0082). Stautner

discloses selecting one of the enhanced features via the feature descriptors tied to a TV program by a viewer (Page 3, paragraph 0036).

Regarding Claim 11, Zigmond, Shoff and Stautner disclose all the limitations of Claim 8. Zigmond discloses displaying one of the enhanced features selected by the user with the corresponding TV program that is synchronized to the selected enhanced feature (Column 7, lines 47-54). Shoff discloses displaying one of the enhanced features selected by the user with the corresponding TV program that is synchronized to the selected enhanced feature (Page 6, paragraph 0067, Figures 8a-8c).

Regarding Claim 12, Zigmond and Shoff disclose all the limitations of Claim 11. Zigmond discloses displaying is performed interactively in response to the user's input (Column 7, lines 47-54). Shoff discloses displaying is performed interactively in response to the viewer's input (Figures 8a-8c, Figure 3).

Regarding Claim 13, Zigmond, Shoff and Stautner disclose all the limitations of Claim 8. Zigmond discloses storing the number of enhanced features from the source of the synchronized web simulcasts from storage in a memory medium for subsequent retrieval on condition that synchronized web simulcasts are not being broadcast currently (Figure 3, Figure 4, 304, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67).

Regarding Claims 20, Zigmond discloses an apparatus for managing television programs and their synchronized web simulcasts (Figure 2, Figure 3, Figure 4), comprising:

a memory for storing computer readable code or software (Column 5, lines 60-67, Column 6, lines 1-3);

and a processor (Figure 4, 303) operatively coupled to the memory (Figure 4) the processor configured to:

detect incoming television signals which can be from different systems or at least one particular source (Column 12, lines 67, Column 13, lines 1-3) for tag information identifying the source of the synchronized web simulcasts for each of a plurality of television programs (Column 7, lines 49-51 - the viewer can change channels) or for each video program received on a broadcast channel with uniform resource locators (URLs) which identify Web pages which correspond to the program as receiver unit detects the resource identifiers as it receives the program via the interface unit and the decoding software of the digital processor (Column 12, lines 67, Column 13, lines 1-3, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67, Figure 3, Figure 4, 303);

establish a web connection to provide a communications channel to the source of the synchronized web simulcasts for each television program (Figure 2, 211);

retrieve a number of enhanced features from the source of the synchronized web simulcasts (Figure 3, Figure 4, 303, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67);

store the retrieved enhanced features in a storage medium for subsequent retrieval (Figure 3, Figure 4, 304, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67) if the tag information indicates that the synchronized web simulcasts are not being broadcast currently and displaying a number of enhanced features from the source of

the synchronized web simulcasts to a viewer if the tag information indicates that the synchronized web simulcasts are being broadcasted currently or the information resource receives an announcement to store the retrieved enhanced features in the local storage and when it is time to display the trigger instructs the receiver unit to display the designated information (Figure 3, Figure 4, 304, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67), the control means coupled to the storage means the detection means and communications means, and a display means coupled to the controlling means for displaying the incoming television programs and one of the retrieved enhanced features selected interactively by the user (Figure 4, 312, 303, Column 7, lines 47-54); and

process the stored enhanced features (Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67, Column 10, lines 33-57) and displaying the incoming television programs and one of the retrieved enhanced features selected interactively by the user (Figure 4, 312, 303, Column 7, lines 47-54).

Zigmond is silent on a plurality of television programs from a plurality of sources; processing the enhanced features to generate feature descriptors; formatting the processed, retrieved enhanced features to predetermined criteria to generate a content list; showing, for all of the television programs, the content list indicating the feature descriptors of the enhanced features associated with that program from which a selection can be made and display one enhanced selectable feature with the corresponding TV program that is synchronized to the selected enhanced feature.

Shoff discloses a plurality of programs and synchronized web simulcasts for each of the programs (Figure 3, Page 7, paragraphs 0081-0082); retrieving a number of enhanced features from the sources of synchronized web simulcasts (Page 2, paragraph 0019),

processing retrieved enhanced features to generate feature descriptors or the viewing computing unit uses the EPG application and the browser application to processes the target resource and target specification to generate feature descriptors for the supplemental content (Pages 5-6, paragraph 0066-0067, Page 3, paragraphs 0036-0039, Figure 3),

formatting the feature descriptors according to predetermined criteria or display layout to generate a content list (Page 4, paragraphs 0042-0047) and displaying a content list (Figure 8b and Figure 8c) and selecting enhanced features (Figures 8b and 8c) and display one enhanced selectable feature with the corresponding TV program that is synchronized to the selected enhanced feature (Page 6, paragraph 0067, Page 7, paragraph 0081, Table 2, Trigger, Figure 8b, Figure 8c).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Zigmond a plurality of programs and synchronized web simulcasts for each of the programs (Figure 3, Page 7, paragraphs 0081-0082), to process retrieved enhanced features without user intervention to generate feature descriptors including names, symbols, icons, labels and timing information (Pages 5-6, paragraph 0066-0067, Page 3, paragraphs 0036-0039), formatting the feature descriptors according to predetermined criteria to generate a

content list (Page 4, paragraphs 0042-0047) display one enhanced selectable feature with the corresponding TV program that is synchronized to the selected enhanced feature (Page 6, paragraph 0067, Page 7, paragraph 0081, Table 2, Trigger, Figure 8b, Figure 8c) as taught by Shoff in order to allow the viewer the supplemental content with the program in a presentation format decided by content providers (Page 1, paragraph 0013) as disclosed by Shoff for an aesthetically pleasing viewing experience.

Shoff's invention does not explicitly disclose a content list for plurality of programs.

In analogous art, Stautner discloses receiving a plurality of television signals from a plurality of television broadcasters (Page 1, paragraph 0007) and enhanced features and processing enhanced features to generate feature descriptors or indicators including icons (Figure 2, 3, 4, 30, 31, 40, 50, 60, 70, 71 and 80) and generating a content list (Page 2, paragraph 0022, 0023, Figures 2-4), and showing for all of the television programs, the content list indicating the feature descriptors or indicators of the enhanced features associated with that program (Figures 2, 3, 4) from which the user can make a selection (Figure 2, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, Figure 3, Figure 4) and display one enhanced selectable feature with the corresponding TV program (Page 3, paragraph 0036). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination to include a plurality of television signals from a plurality of television broadcasters (Page 1, paragraph 0007) and presenting a display to a user showing, for all of the television programs, the content list indicating the feature descriptors or indicators of the enhanced features

associated with that program (Figures 2, 3, 4) from which the user can make a selection (Figure 2, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, Figure 3, Figure 4) and display one enhanced selectable feature with the corresponding TV program (Page 3, paragraph 0036) as taught by Stautner in order to view all EPG information in convenient manner that is more efficient to the viewer.

Furthermore, in *KSR International Co. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct 1727, No. 04-1350, slip. op. at 12 (2007), the Court found that if all the claimed elements are known in the prior art then one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yield predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding Claim 21, Zigmond, Shoff and Stautner disclose all the limitations of Claim 20. Zigmond discloses content listing information selected from the group consisting of length, ending time and a combination thereof (Column 8, lines 30-34). Shoff discloses the content listing information selected from the group consisting of length, ending time and a combination thereof as a frame numbers count the supplemental content from the start time (Page 6, paragraph 0067, Page 4, paragraph 0053).

8. Claims 6, 14, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zigmond in view of Shoff and Stautner as applied to Claims 1, 8, 20, further in view of Ullman et al (US 6,018,768 and hereafter referred to as "Ullman").

Regarding Claims 6, 14 and 22, Zigmond, Shoff and Stautner disclose all the limitations of Claims 1, 8 and 20 respectively. Zigmond, Shoff and Stautner are silent on predetermined criteria defines the number of enhanced features associated with the source of the synchronized web simulcasts. Ullman discloses the predetermined criteria defines the number of enhanced features associated with the source of the synchronized web simulcasts or the URLs represent web sites and URLs are transmitted to the user and the number of the URLs of a source is based on the number of URLs sent to the user (Column 7, lines 12-29, 57-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination to include predetermined criteria defines the number of enhanced features associated with the source of the synchronized web simulcasts or the URLs represent web sites and URLs are transmitted to the user and the number of the URLs of a source is based on the number of URLs sent to the user (Column 7, lines 12-29, 57-62) as taught by Ullman in order to personalize the system to the user's own interests, demographics, history or behavior (Column 7, lines 12-29) as disclosed by Ullman.

9. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zigmond et al (US 6,571,392 and hereafter referred to as "Zigmond") in view of Shoff et al (US 2005/0015815 and hereafter referred to as "Shoff").

Regarding Claim 23, Zigmond discloses a method for simulcast information implemented on a user local data processing device (Figure 2, Figure 3, Figure 4) and a method for presenting simulcast information, comprising:

(a) receiving audio-visual information (Figure 2, 205, Figure 3, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67);

(b) detecting at least one tag in the video information to at least one website simulcasting supplemental information identifying the respective sources of the synchronized web simulcasts or one website simulcasting supplemental information relating to the audio-visual information or a video program with embedded uniform resource locators (URLs) with associated time stamps which identify Web pages which correspond to the program (Figure 2, 205, Figure 3, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67);

retrieving the supplemental information from the at least one website (Figure 3, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67); marking the supplemental information for synchronized display with the audio-visual information (Figure 3, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67).

Zigmond discloses identifying the retrieved enhanced features based on URLs or URIs (Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67) and

processing retrieved enhanced features (Column 10, lines 33-57) and displaying a number of enhanced features from the source of the synchronized web simulcasts to a viewer if the tag information indicates that the synchronized web simulcasts are being broadcasted currently (Figure 3, Figure 4, 304, Column 6, lines 25-36, Column 7, lines 18-31, 55-67),

displaying the incoming television programs and one of the retrieved enhanced features selected interactively by the user (Figure 4, 312, 303, Column 7, lines 47-54).

Zigmond does not explicitly disclose a plurality of programs. Zigmond is silent on formatting the processed, retrieved enhanced features to predetermined criteria to generate a content list, displaying the content list associated with the audio-visual information to a user in relation to each of the plurality of television programs to enable the user to provide a choice indication, receiving the choice indication responsive to the content list; and simultaneously presenting the audiovisual information synchronized together with at least part of the supplemental information, responsive to the choice.

Shoff discloses a plurality of television programs (Figure 3, Figures 8a-c); retrieving supplemental information (Page 2, paragraph 0019), processing retrieved supplemental information without user intervention to generate feature descriptors or the viewing computing unit uses the EPG application and the browser application to processes the target resource and target specification without user intervention to generate feature descriptors for the supplemental content (Pages 5-6, paragraph 0066-0067, Page 3, paragraphs 0036-0039, Figure 3), formatting the feature descriptors for the supplemental information according to predetermined criteria or display layout to

generate a content list (Page 4, paragraphs 0042-0047), displaying the content list associated with the audio visual information (Figure 8b, Figure 8c) to a user in relation to each of the plurality of television programs to enable a user to provide a choice indication (Figure 8b, Figure 8c); receiving a choice indication responsive to the content list (Figure 8b, Figure 8c) and simultaneously presenting the audio visual information synchronized together with at least part of the supplemental information, response to the choice (Figure 6, Figure 7, Figures 8b, 8c, Page 7, paragraphs 0081-0082, Page 8, Table 2, Trigger).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Zigmond to include plurality of television programs (Figure 3, Figures 8a-c); process retrieved enhanced features to generate feature descriptors (Pages 5-6, paragraph 0066-0067, Page 3, paragraphs 0036-0039, Figure 3), formatting the feature descriptors according to predetermined criteria to generate a content list (Page 4, paragraphs 0042-0047); displaying the content list associated with the audio visual information (Figure 8b, Figure 8c) to a user in relation to each of the plurality of television programs to enable a user to provide a choice indication (Figure 8b, Figure 8c); receiving a choice indication responsive to the content list (Figure 8b, Figure 8c) and simultaneously presenting the audio visual information synchronized together with at least part of the supplemental information, response to the choice (Figure 6, Figure 7, Figures 8b, 8c, Page 7, paragraphs 0081-0082, Page 8, Table 2, Trigger) as taught by Shoff in order to allow the viewer the supplemental content with the program in a presentation format decided by content providers (Page

1, paragraph 0013) as disclosed by Shoff for an aesthetically pleasing viewing experience.

Furthermore, in *KSR International Co. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct 1727, No. 04-1350, slip. op. at 12 (2007), the Court found that if all the claimed elements are known in the prior art then one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yield predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

10. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zigmond in view of Shoff as applied to Claim 23, further in view of Ullman.

Regarding Claim 24, Zigmond, Shoff and Stautner disclose all the limitations of Claim 23. Zigmond and Shoff are silent on the audio-visual information and tags are received in the MPEG format. Ullman disclose the audio-visual information and tag are received in the MPEG format (Column 9, lines 59-67, Column 10, lines 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination to the audio-visual information and tag are received in the MPEG format (Column 9, lines 59-67, Column 10, lines 1-3) as taught by Ullman in order to allow different broadcasters to transmit files via any transmission means for a more flexible transmission system (Column 4, lines 49-53) as disclosed by Ullman.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FARZANA HOSSAIN whose telephone number is (571)272-5943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday 7:30 am to 2:30 pm, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday 7:30 am to 4:30 pm and Wednesday 7:30 am to 12:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher Kelley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2424

FEH
May 5, 2009